

REMARKS:

Initially, the Applicants note that the undersigned, Steven J. Laureanti conducted a telephone conference with Examiner Matthew S. Meyers on 23 October 2007 to clarify the Restriction Requirement mailed 18 October 2007. Specifically, Mr. Laureanti requested clarification to the claims listed in Group III. Examiner Meyers stated that the Restriction Requirement mailed 18 October 2007 contained a typographical error and that the correct listing of claims in Group III is Claims 32-40. The Applicants thank the Examiner for clarifying the claims of Group III.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the Restriction Requirement alleges that Claims 1-30 are, drawn to a “method, software and computer-implemented state machine for processing business objects representing collaborations between business entities” and form the basis of Group I. (18 October 2007 Restriction Requirement, Page 2). The Applicants respectfully disagree. In particular, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 31 is also drawn to a “computer-implemented state machine for processing business objects representing collaborations between business entities”, as acknowledged by the Examiner and based on the Examiner’s grouping of the claims. (18 October 2007 Restriction Requirement, Page 2). As such, the Applicants respectfully request correction of Group I to include Claim 31 of Group II.

The Applicants hereby elect Group I including Claims 1-30 (which are directed to a single species), which are further directed to a “method, software and computer-implemented state machine for processing business objects representing collaborations between business entities”, with traverse, in accordance with the applicable Rules of Practice and to advance the prosecution of the subject Application.

In addition, if, based on the Examiner’s grouping of the claims, the Examiner agrees with the Applicants request to correct Group I to include Claim 31, the Applicants, in the alternative, hereby elect Group I including Claims 1-31 (which are directed to a single species), which are further directed to a “method, software and computer-implemented state machine for processing business objects representing collaborations

between business entities”, without traverse, in accordance with the applicable Rules of Practice and to advance the prosecution of the subject Application.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the Restriction Requirement is improper. Accordingly, in traverse, Applicants request withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement. Because, the Applicants have elected an alleged Group and set forth the claims directed to that Group, as set forth by the Examiner, this response is complete. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, Steven J. Laureanti, at (480) 830-2700 with any questions, comments, or suggestions relating to the subject Application.

CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing election and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Although the Applicants believe no fees are deemed to be necessary; the undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayments, to **Deposit Account No. 500777**. If an extension of time is necessary for allowing this Response to be timely filed, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) to the extent necessary. Any fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time should be charged to **Deposit Account No. 500777**.

Please link this application to Customer No. 53184 so that its status may be checked via the PAIR System.

Respectfully submitted,

16 November 2007
Date

/Steven J. Laureanti/signed
Steven J. Laureanti, Registration No. 50,274

BOOTH UDALL, PLC
1155 W. Rio Salado Pkwy., Ste. 101
Tempe AZ, 85281
214.636.0799 (mobile)
480.830.2700 (office)
480.830.2717 (fax)
steven@boothudall.com

CUSTOMER NO. 53184